PTO/SB/21 (04-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL			Application Number	10/675,867		
TRANSMITTAL FORM		· F	Filing Date	September 30, 2003		
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)			irst Named Inventor	Shinichi I	Shinichi Nakamura	
			Art Unit	2861	2861	
			xaminer Name	VO, Anh	VO, Anh T N	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission			Attorney Docket Number	9319H-00	9319H-000562	
		ENCLOSU	IRES (check all that apply)			
		☑ Drawing(s)			After Allowance Communication to Technology Center (TC)	
Fee Attached		Licensing-related Papers			Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences	
Amendment / Reply		Petition		Appea (Appea	Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)	
After Final		Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application		☐ Proprie	Proprietary Information	
Affidavits/declaration(s)		Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address		☐ Status	Status Letter	
Extension of Time Request		Terminal Disclaimer		Other (please	Enclosure(s) e identify below):	
Express Abandonment Request		Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s)		Co	sue Fee Transmittal; omments on Statement of easons for Allowance; return	.
Information Disclosure Statement					post card	
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)		Remarks				
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application						
Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53						
	SIGNATI	URE OF API	PLICANT, ATTORNEY, C	OR AGENT		
Firm · or Individual name	Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C		Attorney Name G. Gegory Schivley		eg. No. 7,382	
Signature		J.	hustry Ohr	when		
Date	August 1, 2005					
	CÉ	RTIFICATE	OF TRANSMISSION/MA	ILING		-
I hereby certify that th Service with sufficient Alexandria, VA 22313-	is correspondence is t postage as first cla	being facsimil	le transmitted to the USPTO	or deposited	with the United States Postar for Patents, P.O. Box 1450	al),
Typed or printed name G. Gregory 80		ivijey	111	Express Mail Label No.	EV 406 075 918 US (8/1/2005)	
Signature		10111	1 10/2000	D-4-	1	

Signature

Date

August 1, 2005

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain of retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 38 U.S.C. /22/and 37 CFR 1.14. This pollection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 223/13-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 223/13-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.





IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.:

10/675,867

Filing Date:

September 30, 2003

Applicant:

Shinichi NAKAMURA

Group Art Unit:

2861

Examiner:

Anh T. N. Vo

Title:

LIQUID DROPLET EJECTION APPARATUS, METHOD OF MANUFACTURING ELECTRO-OPTIC DEVICE.

ELECTRO-OPTIC DEVICE, AND ELECTRONIC

APPARATUS

Attorney Docket:

9319H-000562

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which "the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear [the Examiner's] reasons for allowing a claim or claims." 37 C.F.R. 1.104 (e). In the present case, Applicant believes the record as a whole makes clear the reasons for allowance and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted, especially since the statement may unfairly focus on certain reasons for allowance which are not reflected by the prosecution history. Therefore, the record should reflect that Applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance. For example, while Applicant believes the

claims are allowable, Applicant may not unequivocally agree that patentability resides solely in the specific feature or combination of features identified or patentability, or that each feature or combination of features identified is required for patentability, or that equivalents of any of the recited features are outside the scope of the claims. Moreover, to the extent the reasons for allowance do not separately address the subject matter of all the claims, Applicant does not acquiesce to any inference that the non-addressed claims fail to present other reasons for patentability apart from the patentability of the claims which were specifically addressed by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

By: Gregory Schivle

Reg. No. 27/382

Br/ant E. Wage

Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303

(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/jmz